

REMARKS

Claims 2-10 are pending in this application.

By this amendment, Applicant is amending claims 9 and 10 to rewrite these claims in independent form. Applicant is further amending claim 6 to correct clerical errors, and not for reasons related to patentability. Applicant is also canceling claim 1, without prejudice or disclaimer, to expedite prosecution.

Applicant is further amending the Specification. These amendments do not add any new subject matter because the amendments are fully supported in the Specification as originally filed. For example, the amendment of the paragraph at page 3, line 24, to page 4, line 10, of the Specification is supported in Figure 1 as originally filed, such as by the presence of the box labeled S815 and containing the text "READY" IS DISPLAYED ON OPERATION/DISPLAY PANEL." The amendment of the paragraph at page 32, lines 4 to 26, of the Specification is supported in the same paragraph as originally filed, such as in the same sentence that is being amended. The amendment of the paragraph at page 40, line 22, to page 41, line 3, of the Specification is supported in Figure 4 as originally filed, such as by the presence of the boxes labeled S310 and S311 and the text contained therein. The amendment of the paragraph at page 45, line 25, to page 46, line 19, of the Specification is supported in the same paragraph as originally filed. The amendment of the paragraph at page 49, line 5 to line 26, of the Specification is supported in the same paragraph as originally filed.

Objection to Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings, asserting that “they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: S815, S310, S311” (Office Action, pg. 2, paragraph 1). The Examiner also objected to the drawings on the asserted basis that “they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: S31” (Office Action, pg. 2, paragraph 2).

The Specification is being amended to correct informalities, which renders these objections to the drawings moot.

Objection to Title

The Examiner objected to the title of the application as “not descriptive.” The Examiner asserts that “[a] new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed” (Office Action, pg. 3, paragraph 2). Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. The title of the application is “IMAGE FORMING APPARATUS” and each of the claims is also directed to an “image forming apparatus.” Thus, the title of the application is clearly indicative of the subject matter to which the claims are directed.

Objection to Disclosure

The Examiner objected to the Disclosure because of the following informalities:

on page 32, line 21, “ort” should be changed to “port”;

on page 40, line 25, “(step S31)” should be changed to “(step S310)”;

on page 46, line 6, “warning” should be changed to “warming”; and

on page 49, line 20, “blue” should be changed to “blur.”

The Disclosure is being amended to correct these informalities. Thus, this objection is obviated.

Objection to Claim 6

The Examiner objected to claims 6 because “warming-u’ should be changed to ‘warming-up’” (Office Action, pg. 3, paragraph 5). Claim 6 is being amended to change “warming-u” to “warming-up.” Thus, this objection is obviated.

Allowable Claims 2-8

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her indication that claims 2-8 are allowed.

Objected-to Claims 9 and 10

The Examiner objected to claims 9 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9 and 10 are being rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 1. There are not any intervening claims between claims 9 and 10 and claim 1. Thus, claims 9 and 10 are allowable.

§ 102(b) Rejection of Claim 1 over *Asano et al.*

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0035657 to Asano et al. (“*Asano et al.*”). Claim 1 is being canceled to expedite prosecution. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on July 29, 2004, which has not been acknowledged by the Examiner. Applicant requests that the Examiner acknowledge that this IDS has been considered.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 17, 2005

By: 

Reece Nienstadt
Reg. No. 52,072